



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,458	08/24/2006	Takehiko Sasahara	8118-1002	6825
<div>466 7590 06/10/2010</div> <div>YOUNG & THOMPSON</div> <div>209 Madison Street</div> <div>Suite 500</div> <div>Alexandria, VA 22314</div>				
<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>COLEMAN, BRENDA LIBBY</div>				
<div>ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER</div> <div>1624</div>				
<div>NOTIFICATION DATE DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>06/10/2010 ELECTRONIC</div>				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/590,458

Applicant(s)

SASAHARA ET AL.

Examiner

Brenda L. Coleman

Art Unit

1624

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 10, 22, 41-45, 49, 52, 55, 58, 61 and 73-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 10, 22, 41-45, 49, 52, 55, 58, 61, 73, 75, 77, 79, 81, 83 and 85 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84 and 86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 2, 10, 22, 41-45, 49, 52, 55, 58, 61 and 73-86 are pending in the application.

This action is in response to applicants' amendment filed March 4, 2010. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended, claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 46-48, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60 and 62-72 have been canceled and claims 73-86 are newly added.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendments filed March 4, 2010 have been fully considered with the following effect:

1. The applicant's amendments and arguments are sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection labeled paragraph 4a), b), c), d), e), f), g), h), i), j), k), l), m), n), o), p), q), r) and s) of the last office action, which is hereby **withdrawn**.

In view of the amendment dated March 4, 2010, the following new grounds of rejection apply:

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the applicants' amendment to page 31, lines 14 on page 8 or the amendment indicates the wrong page of the specification, it is believed that the applicants' intended page 32, line 14.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Instant claim language embraces disorders not only for treatment but for prevention which is not remotely enabled. It is presumed in the prevention of the diseases and/or disorders claimed herein there is a way of identifying those people who may develop hyperlipemia, arteriosclerosis or syndrome X, etc. There is no evidence of record, which would enable the skilled artisan in the identification of the people who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the disorders claimed herein.

Where the utility is unusual or difficult to treat or speculative, the examiner has authority to require evidence that tests relied upon are reasonably predictive of in vivo efficacy by those skilled in the art. See *In re Ruskin*, 148 USPQ 221', Ex Parte Jovanovics, 211 USPQ 907, MPEP 2164.05(a).

Patent Protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable. Tossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure. *Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk* 42 USPQ2d 1001

As stated in the MPEP, 2164.08 "[t]he Federal Circuit has repeatedly held that the specification must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993) Nevertheless, not everything necessary to practice the invention need be disclosed. In fact, what is well known is best omitted. In re Buchner, 929 F.2d 660, 661, 18 USPQ2d 1331, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1991) All that is necessary is that one skilled in the art be able to practice the claimed invention, given the level of knowledge and skill in the art. Further the scope of enablement must only bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of the claims. See, e.g., In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). As concerns the breadth of a claim relevant to enablement, the only relevant concern should be whether the scope of enablement provided to one skilled in the art by the disclosure is commensurate with the scope of protection sought by the claims. In re Moore, 439 F.2d 1232, 1236, 169 USPQ 236, 239 (CCPA 1971) See also Plant Genetic Sys., N.V. v. DeKalb Genetics Corp., 315 F.3d 1335, 1339, 65 USPQ2d 1452, 1455 (Fed. Cir. 2003) alleged pioneer status of invention irrelevant to enablement determination."

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1, 2, 10, 22, 41-45, 49, 52, 55, 58, 61, 73, 75, 77, 79, 81, 83 and 85 are allowed. None of the prior art of record or a search in the pertinent art area teaches the compounds, compositions and method of use of the compounds of formula (IA) as claimed herein.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda L. Coleman whose telephone number is 571-272-0665. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brenda L. Coleman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624